



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS.

1. John Ries, *Was ist Syntax?* Ein kritischer Versuch. Marburg 1894. 163 pp.
2. Otto Behaghel, *Die Syntax des Heliand*. Prag, Wien, Leipzig, 1897. 382 pp.
3. Ferdinand Holthausen, *Altsächsisches Elementarbuch* (Sammlung von Elementarbüchern der altgermanischen Dialekte, herausgegeben von Dr. W. Streitberg, Band v). Heidelberg 1899. 283 pp.

THE systematic study of syntax, especially in Germanics, seems to be in a period of hopeful ascendancy. Not as though the *Jahresbericht der germanischen Philologie* contained an appreciably increasing number of syntactical monographs. The above observation is based, rather, on a marked endeavor, in the most notable syntactical investigations of late years, to define more sharply the nature and scope of this part of grammar, and on a more critical attitude toward the whole method of syntactical research.

I.

A review of Dr. Ries's excellent treatise may here seem rather too long *post festum*; yet I do not deem it out of place. For the book, which within a few years after its appearance was reviewed extensively, and generally in a very appreciative manner, in philological journals abroad, classical as well as modern, is not so well known in our own country as it should be, and consequently does not exert the influence that it is destined, and deserves, to have. The reasons for this are difficult to locate; they certainly cannot lie in the presentation, which is clear and distinct, nor in the demands of the book, which are just.

A brief sketch of the contents, which of course cannot do justice to the book, may follow here. The introduction inquires into the causes why as yet no generally accepted definition of syntax has

been given and the question of what syntax really is may still aptly be asked. This is explained from deficiencies in the grammatical system as a whole, and these again find their explanation in the history of syntactical research which is given in bold outlines. Among the ancient Greeks syntax, as far as it was not the handmaid of philosophy and rhetoric to which it owed its origin, was used only for textual criticism and the interpretation of authors; the middle ages naturally could not be expected to show any progress in the right direction; and when in the period of Humanism Latin awoke to a new and artificial life syntax came to be a collection of rules for writing Latin, prescriptions for the avoidance of barbarisms; and the more in subsequent times a writer or speaker fell short of a complete mastery of Latin the more would comparison with his own mother-tongue intrude; conceptions thus gained were then transferred also to the study of other languages, which therefore were all thrown upon the Procrustean bed of Latin grammar. The scientific study of language which is not subservient to any practical purposes and "the sole aim of which is to comprehend its object" (Steinthal) dates back only a few generations. Thus to this very day a considerable number of obstacles obtain, preventing an agreement in the conception of syntax, and an exposition of what syntax really is seems more than ever urgently called for. The demand for such a definition is not a mere war about words, apart from the misconceptions that a wrongly worded definition is liable to engender.

The first part of the treatise proper is a critical review of the existing syntactical systems, none of which entirely satisfies the demands of science. Ries distinguishes three large groups: the mixed system, the Miklosich system, and the system regarding syntax as the doctrine of the sentence.¹ The mixed syntax is a motley congregation of the most heterogeneous elements, both as regards subjects treated (the individual elements of speech as well as sentences, or parts of a rhematology, with frequent encroachments on rhetoric and stylistics) and mode of treatment (starting in the case of the individual words from form, in sentences from content, *i. e.*, from logical points of view). In the rhematology of the mixed system indeed the old "logical" method of linguistic research employed by Becker is still enjoying a safe refuge. If it is not the categories of logic or what is commonly so called it is the

¹The last named will in the following for brevity be referred to by *rhematology*, a word which I take the liberty to coin.

categories of Latin grammar that do violence to the subject-matter.² Under this system—called a system by courtesy only, since an eclectic system is no system at all—syntax becomes a receptacle for everything else that finds no appropriate place in grammar (so much so that with due apology to the unknown author of a rule in Latin grammar it might be said :

“Was sonst nicht unterkommen kann,
Das bringt man in der Syntax an.”

Practically it has the largest following among investigators on syntax, but as a scientific system it has the least claim to recognition because it makes a unified, organic, and natural arrangement of the matter treated virtually impossible.

To avoid the inconsistencies of the mixed system it is necessary to cut out part of the subject-matter. Miklosich,³ in a rather high-handed fashion, threw out the entire rhematology and simply defined syntax as “that part of grammar which treats the meaning (function) of word-classes and word-forms.” It is easy to see that this definition is much too narrow. Unfortunately Miklosich had despite this mistake a host of followers, Scherer and Erdmann⁴ among the German scholars being the most noteworthy; and his system seems to be still growing in popularity. Its excellencies lie in its remarkable clearness and consistency, but the extent of the subject-matter is made to suffer seriously. Miklosich created his system in conscious opposition to Herling and Becker’s logical method (which opposition he shared with others so that it is not a distinguishing mark of his system); and seeing that it was rhematology which was most liable to admit the antiquated method of consideration he became distrustful of rhematology itself and excluded it from his system entirely. In doing so he confused the method of investigation (starting from the meaning the linguistic expression of which is looked for) with the manner and arrangement of presentation (which may, but need not, follow the course of investigation), and moreover confused the method of investigation with its subject (which in the old school was more

² While this objection raised against the mixed system may be practically well founded it would seem as though theoretically it had no more to do with the mixed system than with any other, since these could commit the same mistakes.

³ In his *Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen*, iv². Wien, 1883, p. 1.

⁴ Cf. the preface to his *Grundzüge der deutschen Syntax*, I. Stuttgart, 1886.

extensive and correct than in Miklosich's system). Rigid consistency in carrying out the Miklosich system makes impossible some of the most important chapters in syntax, such as the musical means of sentence-structure, word-order, etc. Therefore Miklosich himself, as well as Erdmann and others of his successors, transgressed the limits of the system in appendices, thereby falling back into the mixed system.

With the conception of syntax as *Satzlehre* or rhematology Ries is more in sympathy. But rhematology is only a part of syntax. The concept 'sentence' itself is open to discussion and should be developed in the syntactical system; and the series of concepts 'sound—word—sentence' is faulty; instead of 'sentence' it should be 'word-group,' since a sentence is only one kind of word-group. A mere sentence-syntax offers no place for word-groups that do not form sentences or cannot be regarded as parts of such. This is shown by the example of Schmalz's *Lateinische Syntax*. The definition of syntax = rhematology is only to be approved of if it is intended as a designation of part for the whole.

This first destructive part of Dr. Ries's book is followed by an even more interesting constructive one which closely examines the relation of syntax to the other parts of grammar and aims at positive results. The deficiencies of all the above systems of syntax are in a large measure to be charged to a wrong division of grammar, particularly to the faulty antithesis of syntax and morphology. The usual tripartition of grammar into phonology, morphology and syntax is to be rejected, for it is without a consistent principle of division. Likewise syntax and semasiology are not the same thing; syntax contains only a part of semasiology, *viz.* the semasiology of word-groups. Since, as Ries shows convincingly, there are many word-forms with absolutely non-syntactical meaning, the semasiology of word-classes and word-forms belongs largely to a part of grammar which as onomatology⁵ (*Wortlehre*)

⁵ I am well aware that this word leaves much to be desired for euphony and has also, even though rarely, been used to designate '*Namenkunde*' or the science of names. Yet it seemed by far the most fitting; for Greek *ὄνομα* means *the individual word* (without reference to syntactical relations). Of the other Greek words that might come into consideration (and a Greek word would be desirable because of the parallelism with *phonology* and *syntax*) *μῦθος* could not, on account of *mythology*, be used for manifest reasons; *ῥῆμος* designates *the word of the poet*, and *ῥῆμα* *the word in connection or sentence* (cf. n. 1, above). A compound like '*verbology*' is distasteful to me. I should be thankful for suggestions on this point.

occupies a position between phonology and syntax. The division of the whole grammar would then be this:

- I. Phonology (*subject of investigation: sound*).
- II. Onomatology (*subject of investigation: the word so far as it is not a member of a syntactical group*).
 - 1. Morphology (*word with reference to form*).
 - a. Inflection.
 - b. Formation (derivation, composition).
 - 2. Semasiology (*word with reference to meaning*).⁶
- III. Syntax (*subject of investigation: word-groups; aim: finding the laws and principles of word-grouping*).
 - 1. Form of word-groups.
 - 2. Meaning or function of word-groups.

Under ordinary conditions the meaning of word-groups will best be treated alongside with their form. It should be the aim of writers on syntax to present tabulated complete pictures of syntactical groups analogous to the tables of inflectional forms in onomatology.

Syntax then is that part of grammar which shows according to what principles individual words join to form higher organic units. For the scholar, who investigates language from within, the word must be of medio-passive meaning = *συντάττεσθαι*; for the pupil, who approaches a language from without, it may be active, a collection of rules by which he has to join the words of that language, *συντάττειν*.

After briefly touching upon the few points of contact between syntax and phonology Ries discusses the relation between syntax

⁶ Under the head of semasiology Ries would treat synonymics, change in meaning, and whatever may be taken out of the purely lexicographical treatment and subjected to systematized consideration. This, no doubt, would be desirable in the complete grammar, but the complete grammar of a language is an ideal that can hardly be realized except in languages of which but few monuments are extant, and the scarcity of these in turn would enhance the difficulties of a systematic treatment of synonymics and change in meaning. Besides a strict adherence to this demand would be likely to overburden the onomatological part of grammar.—Synonymics generally should be treated, not in grammar, but in stylistics (objective or subjective stylistics as the case may be), for in it logical considerations will have to outnumber those of form. With the same, and even more right we might demand in syntax a synonymic treatment of word-groups and sentences.

and stylistics. It is impossible to draw a boundary line between the two in so far as stylistics is by no means a part of grammar. The question, "Does this belong to syntax or to stylistics?" arose from the practical purposes of language-study under which stylistics had to teach the finesses of usage, further from the incorrect definition of syntax, and from the lack of a word-semasiology. The question had better be put, "Does this belong to grammar or to stylistics?"⁷ The matter to be treated is in a large measure shared by the two sciences, and the results gained by grammar stylistics presupposes as known.⁸

Ries does not claim that he is the first and only scholar to give the correct answer to the question at issue, nor that his is the definitive solution of such complex problems. He merely wishes to contribute toward a better understanding, to suggest a renewed discussion, and to warn against the inconsiderate imitation of popular syntactical models. In all of these statements he is entirely too modest; and he should also insist more rigorously on his system being taken up not only in scientific investigations, but in books for practical use as well. What has been theoretically recognized as correct and been confirmed practically⁹ should also find its way

⁷ Cf. "*C'est une question de style et non de grammaire.*" Georges Leygues, *Simplification de la syntaxe française* (Arrêté du 26 février 1901).

⁸ So far as it deals purely with the form the material that stylistics works with is not completely contained in grammar as Dr. Ries would seem to imply. Thus a single writer, a group of such, even a whole speech-community may for their imagery and metaphors draw prevalingly on hunting or fishing, on the sea, the forest, the mountains, agriculture, or war; with such peculiarities, however, grammar has nothing to do.—Stylistics is not separable from the contents, while grammar is to a large extent (just how far has never been clearly set down and would be exceedingly difficult to determine); the greatest nonsense uttered by an insane person may be of strict grammatical purity, and the question whether the means of linguistic expression stands in due proportion to the idea to be expressed it is not for grammar to answer.—Further—another fundamental difference—stylistics, at least objective stylistics, must start from meaning. Like the study of motives, of form, of metrics, stylistics belongs to the domain of æsthetics.

⁹ E. g., F. Holthausen, *Altisländisches Elementarbuch* (Weimar, 1895); O. Weise, *Syntax der Altenburger Mundart* (Leipzig, 1900); Th. Matthias, *Sprachleben und Sprachschäden*² (Leipzig, 1897); L. Sütterlin, *Die deutsche Sprache der Gegenwart* (Leipzig, 1900) of which I expect to write a review shortly. How the system may be applied to stylistics will be shown by Dr. E. A. Boucke, *Wort und Bedeutung in Goethes Sprache* (Schick u. Waldbergs *Literarhist. Forschungen*, vol. xx). My own investigation on *the Adjective in Old Saxon*, the

into books for school use, else the struggle against the old routine will have to be continued for an unduly longer period.

To sum up, Dr. Ries's treatise is a highly significant book which means a new period of syntactical activity and cannot fail to arouse the conscience and stimulate the thought of investigators on grammar in general most thoroughly. Its chief excellencies are independent judgment, clear presentation, critical acumen free from any personal attacks, and full appreciation of what is correct and good no matter where it be found; witness the unstinted praise bestowed upon Miklosich's work and the treatment of what Miklosich, though by mistake, defined as syntax. Paradoxical as it may seem it may be that the dignified tone of the whole book, borne of a strong cause, is the greatest obstacle to its more general recognition, and that a good critical thunderstorm might more quickly have purified the atmosphere and prepared the dry ground for a change in cultivation. We particularly may feel a sincere satisfaction that this most thorough treatise on the true nature of syntax was written by a Germanic philologist. Though it may not, and probably will not, be the last word, yet whoever would keep abreast of the progress in scientific syntax will have to define clearly his standing with reference to Ries's system.¹⁰

II.

The announcement of a Heliand-syntax by Prof. Behaghel had, apart from the subject-matter, aroused an additional interest by the fact that the author had formerly based his lectures on German syntax upon the Miklosich system but was not satisfied by it,¹¹ and in his review of Ries's book¹² took the ground that syntax as

first part of which has just appeared as Bulletin of the Univ. of Wis., Language and Literature Series, vol. I, No. 4, is likewise based on the principles of Dr. Ries's system.

¹⁰ It is safe to assume that after reading Ries's book Prof. C. Alphonso Smith would not have written his paper on *Interpretative Syntax* (Publications of the Modern Language Association, vol. xv, pp. 97-113). What he means by interpretative syntax is in the main nothing else than stylistics, and partly also, e. g. the replacing of lost words for necessary concepts by new ones, falls under the head of onomatology.

¹¹ Cf. remarks to this effect in the introductions to G. Binz, *Zur Syntax der baselstädtischen Mundart* (Stuttgart, 1888), and H. Reis, *Syntax der Mainzer Mundart* (Mainz, 1891).

¹² *Literaturblatt für germ. und rom. Philologie*, 1894, col. 353-355.

usually defined not only was not too wide, but not nearly wide enough. What Behaghel offers is as regards contents and arrangement as different from Miklosich's as it well could be. For novelty of plan, extent and fullness of material, intensity and care of observation, and painstaking industry in structure, Behaghel's book is the most important syntactical publication issued for a long time, and would deserve the attention of philologists also outside of Germanics.¹³

The very instructive preface (11 pages) expounds the author's ideas concerning the object, scope, and method of syntactical research. Behaghel proposes to draw a complete picture of the syntactical phenomena in the Heliand. For this he had no model after which to shape his investigation, in classical no more than in Germanic languages.¹⁴ Naturally enough, he thinks, no other linguistic monument, with the possible exception of the Beowulf, offering itself to such presentation as the Heliand, isolated in time, place and kind, a unit in itself, uninfluenced by models in other languages, and apparently little hampered by its metrical form.¹⁵ The task is not completed by combining the results already gained by numerous monographs in the field of Heliand-syntax (of which he gives a list on pp. xii, xiii); even the syntax ordinarily so called ('*landläufig*') having disregarded a great many phenomena, and the boundaries of syntax usually being drawn too narrow. This leads him to a definition of his views concerning Ries's system,

¹³ It may be remarked by the way that Behaghel originally had planned to treat the word-formation and syntax of Old Saxon as the second part of Gallée's *Altsächsische Grammatik* (Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken der germanischen Dialekte, herausgegeben von W. Braune, vi. Band, Halle, 1891), and that consequently his name appeared on the title-page conjointly with Gallée's. The syntactical material, however, evidently grew under his hands to such an extent as to render its appearance within the frame-work of Braune's collection impossible, and we now have two entirely separate works different in plan, appearance, and price. It is to be regretted that in this way Old Saxon word-formation (which in the second part of Wilmanns' *Deutsche Grammatik* could not receive much attention) has not yet been treated connectedly. Behaghel's work differs further from the original plan also in treating the syntax of the Heliand only, not considering that of the minor monuments.

¹⁴ Erdmann and Wülfing treating only selected facts in the syntax of Otfrid and Alfred; Nygaard's *Eddasprogets Syntax* being entirely defective. Outside of Germanics he quotes Mutzbauer, *Grundlagen der griechischen Tempuslehre und der homerische Tempusgebrauch* (Strassburg, 1893). He does not mention G. Vogrinz, *Grammatik des homerischen Dialektes* (Paderborn, 1889).

¹⁵ It might not be amiss to put a question-mark after parts of this statement.

whose opinion on the boundary-line between syntax and stylistics he readily accepts. He then discusses the division of material between syntax and onomatology, starting from the points of contact between syntax and dictionary. The reproach that Ries makes rigid demands that shall be absolutely normative in all kinds of syntactical investigation seems unjustified considering the modest tone of Ries's book; and so far as descriptive syntax (which Behaghel has chiefly in mind) is concerned it is here that Ries's system works best. Behaghel believes that much (not specified more distinctly) that Ries would exclude from syntax stands in too intimate a relation with syntax, and wishing to write a syntax of the *Heliand* feels under no obligation to write also an onomatology of the same monument.¹⁶ In several important points the author was prevented by external causes from fully completing his treatise: nothing is said about stress-groups (on which he gives his views in Paul's *Grundriss*, vol. I², p. 680 ff.); the accent receives very little consideration, since Behaghel does not believe in inferences drawn from researches on the alliterative verse (p. 107); and the word-order is not treated at all, which means a serious gap. Ries's "*Die Stellung von Subject und Prädicatsverbum im Heliand*" (*Quellen und Forschungen*, xli) is therefore not antiquated by Behaghel's work.

The picture that Behaghel intends to draw of *Heliand*-syntax is to be not only complete but above all objective, unbiased. He thinks that the whole way of looking at syntactical phenomena must radically change. Gottfried Hermann's (and Becker's) logical mode of consideration and transferring of Kantian categories to language having long since been abandoned, the usual method now starts from form instead of from contents, and as a model of this kind Behaghel cites Miklosich's *Slavische Syntax*.¹⁷ But, he believes, investigators have not yet sufficiently rid themselves of transferring upon other languages the categories of Latin grammar or their modern conceptions of linguistic expression. Comparison is therefore consistently excluded. Theoretically this is one of the advantages of the book; for it alone makes possible the completeness after which he strives. It is also justifiable in so far as it is sometimes dangerous to throw light upon a syntactical phenomenon

¹⁶ This objection will hardly hold good; all that Behaghel needed to do was to take over a few chapters from word-semasiology, and to sift and shift the material accordingly.

¹⁷ A last tribute paid to his old love, with a side-glance at Ries's vigorous opposition to the Miklosich system.

in one language by citing a seemingly like phenomenon in another language that may possibly owe its existence to a widely diverging process of linguistic development. But it is also possible to go too far in the opposite direction. Why should comparison which is allowed to the philologist in all fields be denied to him in syntax?¹⁸ There can be no doubt about the intrinsic value of comparison for the sake of elucidation, and in the *Heliand* especially there are numerous obscurities that might easily be cleared up with the aid of other Germanic dialects. Indeed, Behaghel himself adduces comparison in a few isolated instances, as in § 99, p. 56, l. 3 ff.; §§ 111, 113; § 332, p. 209, ll. 12-13; § 488, p. 323, l. 8. In this connection it sounds also rather strange that (p. iv) on occasions it seemed desirable to him to state expressly the absence of a phenomenon. Absence—from what point of view? from that of our modern *Sprachgefühl*? But is not such a procedure “measuring the facts of one speech-unit by the standards of another?”

One consequence arising logically from the author's disregard for comparison and one that doubtless will meet with the disapproval of many is his consistent abstention from explaining the nature of the syntactical phenomena recorded. Such explanations he thinks should be given only on a Germanic basis which can be gained solely by comparison; and he promises a work of this sort for the near future (cf. n. 18).

The chief function of syntax, according to the preface, and as Behaghel has since repeated it in “*Der Gebrauch der Zeitformen in den conjunctivischen Nebensätzen im Deutschen*” (Paderborn, 1899), consists in describing the group-formations in language, in finding out that the homogeneous words *a, b, c, d, e* join in groups with the homogeneous words *r, s, t, u, v*, and that, further, such groups join with certain other groups to form higher units. The first question then would be, “How are these groups formed?” and thus the first two parts (the work is divided into three ‘*Bücher*’) deal with the elements of syntactical formations, and with the means of group-structure (Behaghel, p. ix, l. 15, speaks incorrectly of ‘sentence-structure’). The third part is devoted to the syntactical formations

¹⁸ Would not a strict adherence to this principle virtually preclude the comparative syntax of Germanic dialects which Behaghel says he has in preparation?—Unless I am under a grave misapprehension Behaghel must have changed his views in this respect; cf. his article “*Ich habe geschlossen*,” *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, vol. xxxii, especially p. 69, l. 6 ff.

themselves. In Ries's system the first part would belong to morphology, the second largely to semasiology, only the fourth and fifth chapters of the second book being purely syntactical.

The elements of syntactical groups naturally subdivide into word-classes¹⁹ and word-forms. The means for the formation of syntactical groups may be internal: the meaning of word-classes (showing, *e. g.*, what kinds of combinations the different classes of words may enter), the meaning of word-forms, and the individual (better: *material*, or *lexical*) meaning of single words; or external: congruence, difference in time given to utterance, shades in accent, arrangement of parts of speech. The chapter on word-forms contains everything on nouns lacking either singular or plural, or certain case-forms, adjectives appearing only in certain degrees of comparison, verbs used only in the third person, etc. We catch the first glimpse of the author's working method in the first chapter of this second book, §§ 35–55, in the minutely detailed treatment of the combination, or absence of combination, of substantives with the definite or indefinite article, groups which strictly speaking should be discussed in the third book, § 211 ff.

The concept-words are divided into absolute and relative, Behaghel's further subdivision being into anaphoric or vicarious (without material content, *e. g.*, *the same*); anæmic²⁰ (so general that they afford only a form of conception, *e. g.*, numerals, expressions of quantity); partitive (*e. g.*, *end*, *half*, *ground*); relative proper or connecting (*e. g.*, *father*, *friend*, *servant*). All the relative nouns of the *Heliand* are classified under these categories,—and with so much logical reflection indeed that the times of Gottfried Hermann and Becker seem to have returned, Behaghel here committing the very mistake which he is so anxiously trying to avoid. The adjectives are likewise divided into absolute and relative; the prepositions are treated under the head of relative adverbs. Another chapter under the general head of syntactical function of individual word-meaning deals with 'introlocal' and 'translocal' verbs (Behaghel's terms for Sievers's *verbs of rest and of motion*, cf. *PBrB*, vol. XII, p. 188 ff.), still another with verb-modality (perfect

¹⁹ Why among these the verbs should be left out of consideration entirely (but for their bare mention in § 2), eleven paragraphs being devoted to the other classes of concept-words, is not quite plain.

²⁰ I take this expression, which seems a good translation for Behaghel's '*leer*,' from Prof. Hempf's *German Orthography and Phonology*, § 271.

tive and imperfective verbs, cf. Streitberg, PBrB, vol. xv, p. 70 ff.²¹). The treatment of the external means of syntactical grouping occupies only seven pages (over against 87 devoted to the internal means), five of which are apportioned to congruence, and about a page and a half to general discussions on the accent. The word-order, as mentioned above, is not treated at all.

The third book, the description proper of syntactical formations, comprises the bulk (about three-fourths) of the work as it should. Behaghel treats, first, word-groups; secondly, sentences; thirdly, sentence-groups. The word-groups he divides into defining groups (hypotactical groups, in which one member is defined more nearly by another, or several others, the latter then depending on the one defined) and expanding groups (paratactical groups, in which one member is increased, or varied, by another, or several others; these include numerous cases of variation). The defining groups are arranged according to the classes of words defined, *i. e.*, the words forming the center of the groups; and within this arrangement subdivided according to the number of members joined in a group; a group like *huilic helag man* being regarded as one of three members centering around the substantive, *flesk is unc antfallan* as one of two members centering around the verb. With the numerical system adopted by Behaghel, groups really forming an organic unit ought to have been sharply distinguished from such as, while being a unit in themselves, contain also irrelevant members; this could, however, not have been thoroughly effected without careful regard to accentual conditions.

In this chapter we find all that syntax 'ordinarily so called' treats under the general head of cases. The cases are not represented each as having different meanings: if we do feel a difference in the function of the genitive in *folc ergilo* and *sunu godes* the intrinsic difference lies not in the case itself, but in the elements forming each group, *folc* being an anæmic and *sunu* a connective concept.²² Similarly the meaning of the preposition is the same in

²¹ My own review of Streitberg, Recha, Wustmann, in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, vol. x, pp. 59-62, I should now considerably modify since it does not sufficiently distinguish between verb-perfectivity and sentence-perfectivity.

²² While this point is in itself well taken Behaghel fails to draw from it the necessary historical inferences; and his whole presentation of what syntax 'ordinarily so called' treats under the head of cases rests on no very solid foundation. Examples like the ones just quoted are indeed quite clear and would prove Behaghel's proposition, all the more so since the inherent mean-

an hellea faran and *beran an enaru baru*; the difference lies in the verbal concepts which the prepositional group defines. The chapter on prepositions (p. 131 ff.) seems to me to be one of the best in the entire work.—The expanding groups are treated in a manner analogous to the presentation of the defining groups.

Then follows the chapter on sentences, simple and complex.

ing of the case-suffix (which Behaghel nowhere states) was effaced long before Germanic times. But how about *folc engilo* and *folc gods*? Does the difference of these two groups lie in the different meaning of the word *folc* (which according to Behaghel may be both absolute and anæmic) or in the possibility of a two-fold function of the case? Which of these differences did the Old Saxon feel? for he certainly felt the difference of the two groups. Do we feel two different meanings of *Soldat* or a difference in case-function in *die Soldaten dieses Regiments* and *die Soldaten des Kaisers*? do we analyze *Soldaten* in the former case as = *the armed members of this regiment*, and in the latter as = *the armed servants of the emperor*? Turning—with Behaghel's permission—to Latin and Greek, how about *amor Dei* which may mean either '*God's love for man*' or '*man's love for God*,' and $\delta \phi\acute{o}\beta\omicron\varsigma \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ = 1) *the enemies' fear of us*, 2) *our fear of the enemies*? In both of these cases, so far as these groups are taken out of their connection, a two-fold function of the case is manifest; it is of course correct that the purport of the expression would be evident from the other elements in the sentence. There must from the beginning have been something in the case-suffix that made possible its entering into groups of such manifold relations; something that contained in it the germs of different usages or functions, and these usages and functions must have developed in a manner analogous to the development of different meanings of one and the same word, *i. e.*, resulted from the nature of the various groups entered into. The same process is traceable, *e. g.*, in the history of prepositions; and what holds good for these probably also holds good for the more primitive means of expressing the relations of group-elements to each other, *i. e.*, case-endings, and thus a feeling for the possibility of different functions may have been established.—Even whole sentences may have different functions; cf. German "*Wie lange studieren Sie Deutsch?*" = 1) *How long have you been studying German?* 2) *How long are you going to study German?* 3) *How long do you study German as a rule?* As in the case of the above groups *amor Dei* and $\delta \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu \phi\acute{o}\beta\omicron\varsigma$ the meaning of the groups will become clear from the sentences in which they are contained, so does in this case the meaning of the sentence become evident from the sentence-group. Should we, therefore, entirely abolish syntax and rhematology and have a *Redelehre* (rhetoric) only? Nobody would be willing to go to such an extreme, which can easily be obviated by treating the different functions of word-groups and sentences in appropriate places in syntax. All this raises a very complicated question which to my knowledge has never been touched upon in any theoretical discussion on syntax, and which here could not be treated with the necessary fullness.

Special attention is paid to the manifold ways of sentence-connection (several of which are psychological rather than formal!): insertion; asyndesis; conjunctions in the widest sense of the term, including nouns, ordinals, the pronoun *sulik*, adverbs, conjunctions properly so called, verbs; sentence economy²³ (*Ersparrung*), arrangement of sentences, parallelism and chiasm, etc.

The closing chapters, which are especially good, deal with mixed constructions, containing many valuable additions to a Heliand commentary, and disturbances (anacolutha), from which the language of the Heliand is remarkably free.

And the value of Behaghel's book?

That the work, in extent, arrangement, and point of view, differs radically from its predecessors, if such there be, will be clear from the preceding. It certainly is not a 'system' or 'ordinarily so called' or a slavish imitation of particular models; uninfluenced by any others Behaghel proceeds on his own road. But will this lead us to the ideal syntax? Will it be the only, or, if there be several, the shortest and safest route? It would be hazardous to risk a definitive judgment at present; but there are several important things working against a decided influence of Behaghel's system.

The striking advantages of independence and suggestiveness, the reasonable completeness of the material, the scrutinizing observation, the persevering energy not daunted by the most bewildering mass of details, the untired search after formal principles of division have been mentioned above. They are accompanied by disadvantages scarcely less weighty. The most conspicuous of these is the lack of perspicuity, in which the book seems to stand unrivalled. The number of divisions and subdivisions under each heading is something appalling: cf., e. g., § 267, § 332 on p. 210, and especially § 272, p. 172: *Ar a 1 a aa* **§**; then two subdivisions characterized, without literal notation, by carrying further to the right, and under the second one of these two further subdivisions introduced by *erstens* and *zweitens* written in full.²⁴ The preface justly condemns divisions that are not organic to the subject-matter, but the treatise itself is by no means devoid of them. Many of these minute subdivisions are, briefly speaking, entirely useless and go back only to an inexplicable fancy for classification reminding one involuntarily of those

²³ Various examples quoted under this heading had better be considered as constructions ἀπὸ κοινοῦ (§ 460).

²⁴ Why, by the way, does not Behaghel use instead *aa*, *aaa*, *aaa*, etc.?

well-known Japanese toy-eggs. That, with all this, the book should be issued without an index falls little short of criminal carelessness. I freely confess that notwithstanding a frequent use of the book for four years I still at times do not know where to look for a given syntactical phenomenon. In vain do we look for the Ariadne thread to take us out of this labyrinth; even the detailed table of contents, which is worked out very well, offers comparatively little help. Other deficiencies growing out of Behaghel's overfondness for classification are the disparity of sections (cf. §§ 257-304) and an occasional vagueness of expression which but imperfectly keeps pace with the zeal for the minutiae of tabulation. The lack of perspicuity here deprecated is all the more regrettable since it will tend to militate against the system as such, which is in no wise responsible for it, even though the descriptive process necessitates more attention to details.

Another disturbing factor is the use of new terms for syntactical phenomena. So far as the old terms are distinctly faulty and insufficient this is natural; nor would I take exception to the employment of German words as grammatical designations.²⁵ But it is less gratifying that Behaghel should replace such plain terms as Sievers's '*verbs of rest and of motion*' by '*intralocal and translocal verbs*,' and avoid traditional terms of the syntax 'ordinarily so called,' which are after all not so very bad, by means of lengthy paraphrases.²⁶ On the other hand Behaghel fails to define such terms as perfective and imperfective verbs, simply referring to Mourek's review of Wustmann's dissertation. The book is accordingly not meant for beginners; but that a preposition is a relative adverb, etc., everyone who specializes in linguistics presumably knows.

Finally the book is entirely descriptive, excluding comparison and any attempts at explanation. From this point of view, then, the syntax of the Heliand is not yet complete.—The high price—18 marks—explicable by its fine appearance, tends to be an obstacle to the book's reaching wider circles.

²⁵ How much injury has been done to the extent of observation and to the true appreciation of the facts of German grammar by not fully supplementing the nomenclature of Latin grammar is well shown by Sütterlin, *Die deutsche Sprache der Gegenwart*; cf. the preface, p. x.

²⁶ Thus the doleful concession contained in his adding, in parenthesis, the word 'preposition' to the long definition of this term as 'relative adverb' (§ 161, p. 85) reminds one of the parenthetical addition of *ὁὐκ* after its transcription *oyk* for the benefit of those who can read Greek.

In spite of these deficiencies, for which as stated above the system itself is at most but partly to blame, Behaghel's work remains a great achievement and a decided advance over both the old mixed system and Miklosich-Erdmann; it surely means a decided stride nearer the final answer to the question; it is a really syntactical piece of work. I should not indeed myself recommend its application in the entire grammar of a language; here Ries's system strictly carried out would doubtless deserve the preference, a fact which to my mind Sütterlin has proven. But Behaghel's book seems to me to be worthy of imitation for briefer syntactical monographs that for some reason or other cannot, or are not meant to, consider onomatology. Such a piece of work, which would recognize or show Behaghel's influence, has so far not yet come to my notice. This is regrettable; for with due avoidance of its defects as outlined above the system is well worth a thorough trial.²⁷

²⁷ A few minor points, most of which have occurred to me in connection with my own work in Old Saxon, may be briefly commented upon here:

§ 24 (p. 10) contains the statement that *the* lacks the instr. mas. But it occurs with *brahtmu* (2176, 4189, 4809) which Behaghel quotes as a mas. in his glossary.

The reasons why certain adjectives lack the higher degrees of comparison I have tried to explain in my *Wortlehre des Adjectivs im Altsächsischen* (cf. n. 9), § 74. Cf. also the same, § 76 (comparison of relative adjectives) on Behaghel, § 26 C; likewise § 75 (absolute and relative adjectives) on Behaghel, §§ 119, 120; § 58 c (substantival use of superlative in the gen. and dat.) on Behaghel, § 58 A III, b 2; § 67 (absolute superlatives) on Behaghel, § 92.

The exceptional use of the article in *them salte*, § 39, p. 21, may be easily explained with reference to l. 1363 and the accompanying restrictive relative clause; its use with *doð*, § 41, p. 22, on the ground of its special usage in 4757, 5613, 5641, 5778, where in each case it means the death of Jesus Christ.

§ 42, p. 22. The statement that the weak superlative when used substantively always has the article with it is incorrect; cf. as further exceptions 760, 972, 991, C 4256.

§ 56, B IV read *Dativ und Adverb* (making it, however, identical with II).

§ 57, A I c add *bittar*, *kald*, *scarp*; III b, p. 32, *armscapan* never occurs predicatively; it is attributive in 2186, 3765, 5742, 5748; *gifrodod* is attributive in 208, *gigamalod* in 72. In C II supply after *prädicativ: und substantivisch*.

§ 82 B I in all the words quoted—neuters with long stem-syllables—the use of the uninflected form of the adjective would not make it clear whether the noun was singular or plural; a plain case of language-economy.

In § 105 A II add among the exceptions where the pronoun of the second person singular is inserted, 262–3, 320, 1555, 1561, C 2716, 3269, 3271 (it seems that the insertion of the pronoun is the rule in negative sentences), 3376; where the pronoun of the second person plural is omitted, 881, 1637.

III.

An independent further development of Ries's system of grammar as a whole is presented by the *Altsächsisches Elementarbuch* of Holthausen, who in his *Altisländisches Elementarbuch* (cf. n. 9) had been the first to carry out strictly Ries's suggestions.²⁸ The innovation is, outwardly considered, a step backward, inasmuch as it shows again the old tripartition of grammar into phonology, morphology, and syntax, that Ries combats so strongly. But yet it shows a distinct advance over this older division: discussions, under the title of 'general remarks,' on the extent and function of word-classes and word-forms are taken out of what used to be indiscriminately burdened upon syntax and are made to precede the inflectional forms.²⁹ The word-formation is not treated. As to the third part it is to be observed that Holthausen does not pretend to furnish a complete syntax, however brief, of Old Saxon, but entitles this part 'Remarks on Syntax.' The examples cited here are largely taken from Behaghel's Heliand-syntax (unfortunately without the exact references to the lines of the poem, and occasionally incomplete). It is not the least merit of Holthausen's book to have made the most important results of Behaghel's work more accessible. Considering the pedagogical purpose of the book it is also gratifying that the time-hallowed terms of syntax 'ordinarily so called' have

An explanation as to why in the imperative no personal pronoun is put in the singular but regularly in the plural is desirable: the 2nd plural does not differ in form from the first and third.

§ 197, p. 105, l. 3 from below, add 3161.

§ 214, beginning, useless repetition of § 160 A, p. 85, bottom.

The book is remarkably free from misprints. The following need correction: p. 7, l. 5, from below, *hanðmahal*, r. *handmahal*.—p. 12, l. 3, *enig*, r. *enag*.—p. 20, l. 5, § 8, r. § 38.—p. 32, l. 2, *gifrodod*, r. *gifrodod*; § 57 C1, l. 3, *thea uuarun imu*, r. *imu*.—p. 82, § 157 A, l. 4, *euualden*, r. *enuualden*.—p. 94, l. 4 from below, *S. XII 188*, r. *XII S. 188*.—p. 96, under B, *belðian*, r. *beldian*; *geðan*, r. *geldan*.—p. 153, l. 6, *arabeðie*, r. *araðedie*.—p. 175, § 280, l. 2, *uns*, r. *unc*. (The form *uns*, which of course would be impossible in Old Saxon was strangely enough taken over uncorrected from Behaghel's Heliand edition.)—p. 196, III b 1 a, *hobða*, r. *hoðda*.—p. 198, § 313 A, *hobðu*, r. *hoðdu*.—p. 265, § 420, *gimarlicara*, r. *giamarlicara*.

²⁸ Excepting that under the head of onomatology, by an oversight, he made three parallel divisions, viz. morphology, formation, and semasiology (instead of I morphology: 1) inflection, 2) formation, II semasiology).

²⁹ §§ 258–261; 328; 330; 334; 337; 340; 343; 345; 346–8; 349–52; 392–397.

not been discarded; thus, *e. g.*, the cases reappear with different functions. One regrettable feature of the syntactical portion is the fact that so few examples are quoted from the Old Saxon Genesis and the Minor Monuments; I have counted only about half a dozen.—The remarks on syntax are subdivided according to word-groups and sentence-groups. The problematical questions raised by the accent are naturally enough disregarded. The word-order likewise receives no attention.

Syntactically Holthausen's book marks also a considerable improvement on the mixed system and Miklosich. But the misleading title of the second part should be corrected into onomatology.³⁰

EDWIN C. ROEDDER.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
September, 1901.

³⁰ While we are concerned here chiefly about the syntactical system represented by Holthausen's book the inconsistency in examining the rest of the contents will be pardonable. The introduction contains a long list of references to the literature on Old Saxon; the additional literature on the Heliand may readily be looked up in Piper's edition. Behaghel's *Syntax des Heliand*, probably by an oversight, is not given with the place and date of publication. Chapter II describes the place and divisions of Old Saxon, III the sources, among which strangely enough are wanting the Baptismal Vow, the Indiculus superstitionum, the Abecedarium Nordmannicum, the Parisian Prudentius Glosses, the Gandersheim and Merseburg Glosses. In § 13 we may now add what is said on the home of the Heliand and its poet by Wrede (*ZfdA* 43, pp. 333–360), Roethe (*Anzeiger* of the same volume, pp. 387–390), Kaufmann (*ZfdPh* 32, pp. 511–520), Collitz (*Publ. of the Mod. Lang. Ass. of Am.*, 16, pp. 123–140). Holthausen himself takes a negative view. Chapter IV deals with the writing.

The first part of the grammatical treatise contains the excellent phonology, the more or less problematical character of which Holthausen emphasizes in the preface. On § 81 it might be remarked that the wording of Braune's *Althochdeutsche Grammatik*, § 27, n. 4, deserves preference over Holthausen's.—§§ 196 and 201 should contain a statement that *ft* > *ht*, *þl* > *fl* are not sound-changes but sound-substitutions.—§ 205: only the initial *th* of unstressed words is assimilated to a preceding *t*.—In § 216 *h* is designated as the voiceless glottal fricative also initially before consonants, while according to § 54 it would indicate only the unvoicing of these consonants (as in British English); the latter would also be suggested by § 217. The weakness of initial *h* is also proved by *hi* alliterating with *j*, *gi*, *ge*. (That *h* + consonant alliterates also with *h* + vowel is no proof against its weakness; we may here have to do with a phenomenon nearly parallel to Old Norse '*Reiþr vas þá Vínþórr*' where the *r* of *reiþr* < **vreiþr* alliterates with *v*).—§§ 204 and 233: Would not the development of *ʃs* > *ds* > *ts* and *ʒs* > *gs* > *ks* (by dissimilation) be more